1	IN THE CRIMINAL COURT FOR SUMNER COUNTY, TENNESSEE
2	AT GALLATIN
3	
4	STATE OF TENNESSEE )
5	) NO / CR875-2017 Vs. CR133-2020
6	vs. ) CR133-2020 ) CR548-2017
7	ANDY LAMAR ALLMAN )
8	
9	
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	April 2, 2020
13	VOLUME I OF II
14	
15	
16	
17	·
18	THE HONORABLE DEE DAVID GAY PRESIDING
19	
20	j.
21	
22	
23	LORI C. BICE, LCR Criminal Justice Center
24	117 W. Smith Street Gallatin, Tennessee 37066
25	(615) 414-8993
	<u>Exhibit H</u>

90-day window. We're looking at a 90-day window, and the risk to the public in this 90-day window, to me, is not great enough in this 90-day window to outweigh the benefit of having the house arrest at this time based on the nature of this case and the fact that we've got -- we've got -- all the gears are running hard right now to try this case in August.

And the Nashville case, it's going to be tried in July, and the outcome from that case may

be tried in July, and the outcome from that case may make the point of house arrest moot. I don't know.

But, again, we're looking at a very small window here, Your Honor, and that's -- I think that needs to be weighed heavily. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I want to thank the attorneys for your professionalism, the way you presented your proof, and how you've handled this whole hearing for two days. I didn't know much of anything about this case and I've learned pretty much the last couple of days. I've never seen anything like it.

And let me temper my comments here.

I'm making my rulings and statements according to the evidence that I've heard the last couple of days. I'm not making any final judgment. I'm

called upon to rule on a motion to reduce bond. I'm called upon to rule on a motion to revoke the bond. And to that extent we have had a lot of evidence introduced, and my comments are a reflection on the evidence that has been presented to me up to this time and point in this particular case. I know there's more to come, more to hear, but I am limited to what I've heard up to this point along with the legal issues.

We'll start with the statute in the motion to reduce -- in the motion to revoke the bond and the motion to reduce the bond. We will take them altogether because a lot of the issues are the same. But on the Burgins issue, as I said yesterday, 40-11-141, it authorizes the trial judge to hold a defendant without bail pending trial, without release if the defendant violates a condition of the release or is charged -- and "charged" is the key word there in the statute -- charged with an offense committed during the defendant's release.

Now, Burgins says if the trial court finds that the State has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant has violated a condition of the release and committed a criminal

offense while on bond, the trial judge may either revoke bail and hold the defendant until trial to continue bail -- or continue bail with a possibility of additional conditions or an increased bond amount.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first thing I want to comment on is the proof that I have heard today about the crime that was committed while the defendant was on bail. And in this particular matter the evidence I've heard is overwhelming. We've heard from the defendant [sic] by phone in Florida, Mr. Herrera. We went through his history, and it sounds like a lot of what's gone on with these 30, 29, 28 cases that we have pending in this court. We have pending three counts of theft over a thousand dollars, 12 counts of theft over 2500, two counts of theft over \$60,000, two counts of theft over \$10,000, seven counts of falsely representing himself as a lawyer, one count of impersonating a licensed professional, and one count of practicing without a license. then we've got another C felony with Mr. Herrera and another issue about holding himself out as a lawyer.

Now, same MO. The victim was going through a divorce. He retained Mr. Allman. I don't know where -- anywhere here, according to his

testimony, there was ever any comment or language about a fee, and I know that's what an attorney works for, but according to the testimony there was none. He was satisfied with the results of the divorce, and then the house got sold and he was to get one half of the \$120,000.

Now, it looks like from the proof today that the defendant -- or excuse me, the victim, there was an order to return this money to the defendant [sic] when the divorce was final. We heard the -- we've got a copy of that order, 2014. The next day the defendant cashed this check and placed it into his account and then he wrote a check and put it in another account.

Mr. Herrera testified from 2014 until 2/5/20, six years, he had not received anything. He began calling the defendant -- and I think it's pretty credible that he was told by the defendant to call or check on it when his daughter was about -- was past age 18. And on 5/20/19 was her graduation. On 8/3/19 was her birthday, and he called two weeks later to get the money, and from that period of time on until he talked to Stephanie Boiano at the DA's office he was under the impression, still after five years, that he was going to get his money. He

didn't know that it had already been taken care of.

Now, his credibility is borne out by text messages I see that Mr. Allman is carrying out a charade, a lie, and a fraud, and according to the testimony of Mr. Herrera he didn't say he couldn't practice law; he didn't say what his fee was; he said he was working on it as if nothing was wrong.

Now, conclusion, you've got the check, you've got the money trail, and all the evidence from the bank. I find by a preponderance of the evidence the testimony has shown that he committed a theft and that he held himself out as an attorney.

Now, in considering that, I must consider now whether the bond should be increased, whether the bond should be left the same with different conditions and so forth. And I look at different factors that the Supreme Court has set out and the Court wants me to look at 40-11-118 in considering what to do here, in considering danger to the community, in considering the likelihood that he will not show up for trial. Those are the two concerns that we have.

Sometimes we focus only on whether or not the defendant is going to show up, but case law, statutory law shows that there's that second factor

here. You know, it's about that public out there, the safety to the public, and one of the things I've got to consider is 40-11-118, and we've gone through those.

The first factor here, the defendant's length of residence in community is good. He's been here his life -- entire life. His employment status history, financial condition, that's not good. Any way you stretch it it's not good. His law firm went through receivership. Claims against him from at least 222 clients total \$1.1 million. There's evidence that he's having difficulty paying a mortgage. There's evidence that one time he filed bankruptcy, although that was dismissed. So the financial condition, employment status, not good, not good.

Family ties and relationships, I looked at all the letters. They are good. He is married a second time, got two children from his first marriage, and he's been married this time six years, and that is fine.

I've got a concern with the next condition, his reputation, his character, and his mental condition. I think the overall reputation is poor; character, poor.

Mental condition, I'm going to be honest with you. That really bothers me. What in the world is going on here from a man that had a good practice, a good reputation, no issues, suddenly in a period of time we've got a major meltdown that affects all of Middle Tennessee where his clients reside? Up to this point, I have had no explanation as to what was going on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I do not accept the premise from Mr. Willis that things got out of hand. There is too much here in the record putting off clients, neglecting clients. Yes, that's ethical situations, but then we move to lying to clients, shifting money that the defendant is not entitled to, and at least at this point in time we've got 222 claims, \$1.1 million, and that just doesn't happen by accident. It doesn't. Mr. Allman is too sharp an individual to fail accidently to this extent, and I don't know what is going on with him mentally. I've got a major concern there, and I don't have any explanation, and we'll wait, I guess, to the trial, but up to this point there is no excuse from what I have seen from the evidence of anything. I understand that we might have issue with some retainers and I'll get to that in a minute, but the

overall situation really disturbs me.

Prior criminal record and record of appearance at court proceedings, good. Apparent probability of conviction, strong.

Now, Mr. Copas talked about some of the retainer claims, and I don't know what's going to become of them. The same MO, same thing, it's, I don't give a rip about these clients and I'm not going to take care of them; I'm not going to answer them; I'm going to lie to them; I'm going to put them off. I'm going to be the same way with the Board of Professional Responsibility. And he was disbarred three times over the way that he conducted business. Unbelievable. That is completely unbelievable.

If you consider the strength of the proof here, you go through all those retainer cases and you wonder what's going on. How can you have, what is it, 23, 20 people have this kind of an issue with this defendant?

And then look what we've got in addition to that. You've got these cases with theft of funds. They're not retainer cases. Rosa Ponce, \$14,694. Floyd Kenneth Sutton, \$16,433. Same story, same plan, going to get my money. No, you're

1 not. Mr. Allman has taken it. Sorry. I'll put you 2 off, I'll not answer you, and I'll just let things 3 fly. 4 Client estate funds. \$108.077 of 5 Brenda Sue Ingram, no explanation. Estate of Jane 6 Ellen Denney, \$106,403, no explanation. 7 And then the testimony we heard on the motion to sever, that poor lady on that estate down 8 9 in Nashville, you cannot help but get emotional, 10 Mr. Allman, at \$230,000 that was hers that you took. 11 No explanation. The proof is strong, very strong. 12 The likelihood of conviction in over 50 percent of 13 these cases is great. 14 Now, I don't know -- that's another 15 thing that bothers me about Mr. Allman. He seems 16 not to let anything affect him. He's every second 17 looking to correct his attorney or write things 18 down, or whatever, but I have not heard anything, 19 and I just don't know what's going on mentally 20 there. 21 Now, the case is strong, and in 22 considering the public safety here, you've got to 23 look at the fact that Ms. Cheryl Garrett said, are you still my lawyer? 24 Yes.

You've got to look -- here he is in

25

2017. The TBI is serving search warrants. He's been suspended for years. TBI called, talked to his mother and wife, and he says, I'm unavailable. I'm meeting with a client. There's a lot to what the General says that nothing is going to stop him. What's house arrest going to do to him if he's got a phone?

Considering the safety of the public,
Russ Willis, unbelievable. I don't know how the
Board of Professional Responsibility got it all
together. They did a very good job in going through
these cases and presenting these different petitions
and trying to protect the public from an attorney
that appeared to be out of control. Contempt,
receiverships, temporary suspension. Three
petitions, 208 claims; the fourth petition pending,
14; 222 claims. Now, some of these things were gone
through. Some were eliminated, but that's where we
stand right now.

And I don't care how you want to spin this, you can't spin it. From the end of 2015 until 7/30/2018, there was this area where I don't know what's going on with the practice of law with Mr. Allman and his life. It affected state trial courts, it affected federal courts and -- to the

1 tune of \$1.1 million. That does not include the causes of actions that were destroyed, lost, or 2 3 other areas. 4 6/19/18, the first disbarment; 5 7/13/18, the second disbarment; 7/30/18, the third disbarment, and yet we heard the testimony today 6 7 from Mr. Herrera. It doesn't appear that Mr. Allman 8 gives a rip about the rule of law, about discipline, or about following orders that anybody wants to make 9 10 about his practice of law. And you want to see 11 behind the damage that is done, it's like Sherman 12 going through Georgia, destruction. 13 The complaints, the millions of 14 dollars, so bad that the Board had to file a 15 petition for receivership. Mr. Willis stated that 16 the numbers became so great they were overwhelming. 17 His response initially, promises about getting the 18 documents, I'm talking to my clients, all a 19 misunderstanding. And it's all about earning fees. 20 All I can say is what I've heard up to this point, 21 balonev. 22 We've got a situation where Mr. Allman

was so bold as to continue to practice law to where with his dealings with Smelser and Kelley he was held in contempt in the proceedings by the Board of

23

24

25

There is no excuse, no excuse.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I've considered reducing the bond. I've considered adjusting the bond. I have kept all my options open through this hearing, but I can't help but think in the short period of time and the damage that's done and whether or not anybody will ever recover, and the fact that he makes bond and he goes out and continues indicates to me that Sherman is still continuing through Georgia and destruction is still going on while the defendant was out on I don't know what else we can do but put somebody out on bond with restrictions, and to violate the law and to be an attorney and to do this intentionally goes straight to the heart of justice, and it goes straight to the heart of safety of the public from attorneys that might possibly be We still have a way to go yet. But, criminals. again, I'm only commenting and referring to the proof I've heard to this point.

Mr. Allman, based on everything that I have just said, based on the restrictions and the law as laid out by Burgins, I find that there is a preponderance of the evidence that you've committed two crimes, one while you were out on bond and the other one was part of a fraud and cover up and

Professional Conduct [sic], 10 days for each charge. That didn't stop him. It didn't stop him one bit. He's still going on, and before he was arrested there's no telling what he was doing, but we do know that he was still leading Mr. Herrera on, and leading him to believe that his case was still pending, that he still mattered, not knowing that Mr. Allman pocketed the money four or five years ago. And there's no way any fee for what he did would amount to the \$59,000 that he took.

Now, we've got to protect the public from many things. We've got to protect the public right now from this virus. We've got to protect the public right now from violent crimes and repeat offenders. Every 50 minutes somebody is killed on a highway by somebody driving under the influence, killed in this country. There are all kinds of dangers.

You look at the public. Do you remember what was said in the Declaration of Independence? Life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Anybody that's been touched as a client under these circumstances has been devastated and the proof shows that while the defendant was on bond he continued his deceptive practices and fraud.

```
1
    continuation of a crime that you committed some time
    ago. You are a danger to the public if you are out.
2
 3
    Your bond is revoked, sir, and you will be held in
    custody until this trial. That will be the order of
 4
 5
    the Court.
6
                  Anything else that we need to take up?
                  GENERAL DEAN:
                                  No, sir.
 7
                  THE COURT: We may be in recess.
8
                  (Proceedings concluded at 3:15 P.M.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```